## MEMORANDUM

April 26, 2010

TO: Management and Fiscal Policy Committee

FROM: Karen Orlansky, Director

Aron Trombka, Senior Legislative Analyst

Office of Legislative Oversight

SUBJECT: Update on Executive's Recommended FY11 Reduction-in-Force for the County

Government

Based on the Executive's April 22 budget adjustments, we have prepared updated data tables on the recommended FY11 County Government reduction-in-force. The Executive's budget adjustments include 14 additional position abolishments. A list of the additional recommended position abolishments appears on the last page of this memorandum.

### I. Overview

When combined with the reduction-in-force included in the March 15 operating budget submission, the Executive now recommends a total of 466 position abolishments in FY11, including 244 filled positions.

## County Executive Recommended FY11 Position Abolishments for County Government

	Filled Positions	Vacant Positions	Total Positions
March 15 Submission	232	220	452
April 22 Adjustments	12	2	14
Totals	244	222	466

OLO's April 15 memorandum to the MFP Committee analyzed the Executive's recommended position abolishments by bargaining unit and by grade range. Page 2 of this memorandum updates the data on filled position abolishments by bargaining unit to incorporate the Executive's April 22 recommendations. Page 3 updates the filled position abolishment data by grade range.

# II. Filled Position Abolishments by Bargaining Unit

Of the 12 additional filled position abolishments recommended by the Executive on April 22, ten are MCGEO-represented positions and two are non-represented positions. The Executive did not recommend abolishing any filled FOP or IAFF positions.

The table below compares the overall compensation of the County Government workforce by bargaining with the distribution of filled position abolishments by bargaining unit. The data in the table combines the Executive's March 15 and April 22 recommendations. (This table updates Table 3 on © 18 of OLO's memorandum for the April 19 MFP session.)

<u>Finding</u>: As the Executive does not propose elimination of any filled FOP or IAFF positions, the recommended FY11 budget eliminates MCGEO and non-represented filled positions in greater proportion to their distribution in the County Government workforce.

Workforce Composition and Distribution of Position FILLED Abolishments Executive's March 15 and April 22 Recommendations Combined By Bargaining Unit

Bargaining Unit	Percent of Workforce (a)	Percent of Position Abolishments (b)	Ratio (b) to (a)
MCGEO	57%	73%	1.28 to 1
FOP	11%	0%	
IAFF	11%	0%	
Non-Represented	21%	27%	1.29 to 1

<sup>\*</sup> This ratio shows the proportionality between each bargaining unit's share of position abolishments and that unit's representation in the workforce. A ratio greater than 1 to 1 indicates a higher than proportional share of abolishments; a ratio lower than 1 to 1 shows a lower than proportional share.

# III. Filled Position Abolishments by Grade Range

In our memorandum for the April 19 MFP session, OLO showed the distribution of the County Government workforce sorted into four grade ranges: Grades 5-15; Grades 16-21; Grades 22-26; and Grades 27 and above. Of the 12 additional filled position abolishments recommended by the Executive on April 22, nine are in Grades 5-15, and one each in the other three grade ranges.

The table below compares the overall compensation of the County Government workforce by bargaining with the distribution of filled position abolishments by bargaining unit. The data in the table combines the Executive's March 15 and April 22 recommendations. (This table updates Table 6 on © 26 of OLO's memorandum for the April 19 MFP session.)

**Finding:** Employees in Grades 26 and below account for 88% of the (non-public safety) workforce and comprise 87% of the proposed filled position abolishments. Employees in Grades 27 and above account for 12% of the (non-public safety) workforce and comprise 13% of the proposed filled position abolishments.

Workforce Composition and Distribution of Position FILLED Abolishments Executive's March 15 and April 22 Recommendations Combined By Grade Range

Bargaining Unit	Percent of Workforce <sup>2</sup> (a)	Percent of Position Abolishments (b)	Ratio (b) to (a)
Grade 5-15	33%	28%	.85 to 1
<b>Grade 16-21</b>	31%	36%	1.16 to 1
<b>Grade 22-26</b>	24%	23%	.96 to 1
Grade 27+	12%	13%	1.08 to 1

<sup>\*</sup> This ratio shows the proportionality between each grade range's share of position abolishments and that grade range's representation in the workforce. A ratio greater than 1 to 1 indicates a higher than proportional share of abolishments; a ratio lower than 1 to 1 shows a lower than proportional share.

3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Appointed officials, members of the Management Leadership Service, medical doctors, and some other management positions are not classified by numeric grade. For this exercise, OLO included these positions in the "Grade 27 and above" category.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The data excludes represented public safety employees that are classified in different salary grade schedule than general County Government employees.